

PR4



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/139,798	08/25/1998	WILLIAM L THOMAS	UV-57	5738

7590 10/03/2002

G VICTOR TREYZ  
FISH & NEAVE  
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 100201104

EXAMINER

HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2611

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/139,798

Applicant(s)

THOMAS ET AL.

Examiner

Son P Huynh

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-118 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 November 1998 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) (2)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "that", page 20, line 19, is repeated; application Serial No, page 27, line 27, must be provided

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily

Art Unit: 2611

published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 69-70, 77-83, 86, 89-90, 92-93, 100-106, 109, 112-113, 115-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335).

Regarding claim 69, Hendricks et al. (hereafter referred to as Hendricks) discloses a system comprising operations center 202, cable head end 208 and set top terminal 220 (see figure 1). Hendricks further discloses the set top terminal 220 stores data, tracking program that have been selected for viewing. By gathering this data, the set top terminal 220 can maintain an accurate record of all programs accessed/watched by storing the data in EEPROM or RAM. Subsequently, this data can be transmitted to the cable head end 208, where it can be used in carrying out network control and monitoring functions (see col. 14, lines 50+) and operations center 220 uses this return data for statistical or billing services (see col. 5, lines 53-54 and col. 8, lines 26-34). In addition, Hendricks discloses the hit movies category 1048 is a list of recently released movies which have been found to be popular among movie goers (see figure 16 and col. 32, lines 17-20). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting real-time ratings information based on the activities of users at user television equipment; and means for displaying the real-time ratings information on the user television equipment in real time.

Regarding claim 70, Hendricks discloses the system comprising means for providing an opportunity for defining a time frame for the real time rating (see figure 16 and col. 32, lines 19-35).

Regarding claim 77, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting a genre for the real time ratings (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 78, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real-time ratings are for television programs (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 79, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real time ratings are for applications (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 80, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real time ratings are for non-program guide applications (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 81, Hendricks discloses means for providing an opportunity for selecting whether the real time ratings are for video games (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 82, Hendricks discloses means for displaying real time ratings information comprises means for displaying real time television program ratings (see figures 14 and 16).

Regarding claim 83, Hendricks discloses means for displaying real time ratings information comprises means for displaying real time video game ratings (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 86, Hendricks discloses means for allowing each user to select which type of real time ratings are displayed (see figure 14).

Regarding claim 89, Hendricks discloses the real time ratings information comprises a list of programs, the system further comprising means for selecting one of the programs to purchase (see figures 16-17).

Regarding claim 90, Hendricks discloses the real-time ratings information comprises a list of programs, the system further comprising means for selecting one of the programs to set a reminder for that program (see figures 16, 19 and col. 34, lines 45-48).

Regarding claims 92-93, 100-106, 109, 112-113, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 69-70,

77-83, 86, 89-90 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims  
69-70, 77-83, 86, 89-90

Regarding claim 115, Hendricks discloses a system in which an interactive television program guide is implemented on user television equipment, comprising:  
means for displaying program guide display screens on the user television equipment with the interactive television program guide; and means for collecting information on which program guide display screens are displayed in the interactive television program guide (see col. 14, line 50+ and figures 28e-28g).

Regarding claim 116, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 115 and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 115.

Regarding claim 117, Hendricks discloses a system in which an interactive television program guide is implemented on user television equipment, comprising:  
means for providing an opportunity for a user to use non-program guide applications on the user television equipment; and means for collecting information on which non-program guide applications are used (see col. 14, line 50+ and figures 14 and 22's).

Regarding claim 118, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 117 and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 117.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-52, 54-60, 63-65, 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (US 6,412,110), and in view of Seidman et al. (US 6,298,482).

Regarding claim 1, Schein et al. (hereafter referred to as Schein) discloses a system in which advertisements are displayed for users by an interactive television program guide implemented on user television equipment, comprising means for displaying the advertisements on the user television equipment with the interactive television program guide (see figure 7). However, Schein does not explicitly disclose means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements.



Seidman discloses a system for monitoring the popularity of programs and commercial messages according user activity. User activities is recorded in the selection history records and transmitted to the head end (see figures 1 and 2A). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements in the program menu. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein to incorporate a means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements as taught by Seidman in order to give more efficiency in providing advertisements to consumers in future.

Regarding claim 2, Seidman discloses the historical report comprising number of commercials viewed 74 (see figure 6). Inherently, the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the amount that the advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 3, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprising channel, program name, program category, name of selected object, sub-selection information (see figure 4). Inherently, the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the location in the program guide where the advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 4, Seidman discloses the system comprises means for collecting information on which advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 5, Seidman the collecting information comprises the name of program, the name of object selected (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting advertisement identifier information, which identifies which advertisements are displayed.

Regarding claim 6, Seidman discloses the historical report comprises number of commercials viewed (figure 6). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting information on the number of times each advertisement is displayed.

Regarding claim 7, Seidman discloses the selection record comprises channel number, program name, program category, object name, sub-selection information, (see figure 4). Inherently, the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on which program guide screens advertisements are displayed on.

Regarding claim 8, Seidman discloses once the user has selected from among the alternatives which are displayed, the STB relays this selection to the head end, in addition to storing the selection information in the user's selection history (see col. 5, lines 53-56). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting information on

which screens are active when a given one of the advertisements is selected by one of the users.

Regarding claim 9, Seidman discloses once the user has selected from among the alternatives which are displayed, the STB relays this selection to the head end, in addition to storing the selection information in the user's selection history (see col. 5, lines 53-56). Inherently, the system comprises means for collecting information on which user actions result directly from selection of a given one of the advertisements by one of the users.

Regarding claim 10, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the times that advertisements are displayed (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 11, Regarding claim 10, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the times that actions are taken automatically by the program guide (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 12, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises channel number, program name, category name, object name, sub-selection information, (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information on which screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 13, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises channel number, program name, category name, object name, sub-selection information, (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting screen identifier information that uniquely identifies which program guide screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 14, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises tuned channel (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information on the frequency with which certain program guide screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 15, Seidman discloses the collecting information comprises tune begin, tune end (see figure 4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information on the duration for which program guide screens are displayed by the program guide.

Regarding claim 16, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on how users arrive at program guide screens in the program guide (see figure 2A-3).

Regarding claim 17, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on which television programs are displayed on the user television equipment (see figure 4).

Regarding claim 18, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on whether a user interacts with the program guide during the display of a given program on the user television equipment (see figures 2A-3).

Regarding claim 20, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Seidman further discloses the detailed description of viewing behavior and activity is monitored and recorded in the selection history records 13 (see col. 6, lines 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for collecting information on whether a screen overlay is present on the user television equipment during the display of a given program on the user television equipment in order to provide a detailed description of user behavior.

Regarding claim 21, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on which non-program guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figures 4 – 6).

Regarding claim 22, Seidman discloses means for collecting information with the program guide on which non-program guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 23, Seidman discloses whenever user selects a program or message from the menu, the selection information is recorded in the selection history (see figures 2B –4). Inherently, the system comprising means for collecting information on how users invoke non-program guide applications on the user television equipment.

Regarding claim 24, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the amount that non-program-guide applications are used on the user television equipment (see figure 6).

Regarding claim 25, Seidman discloses the advertisements are transmitted to user television from CATV head end, the system further comprises means for monitoring when advertisements that are transmitted from the CATV head end to the user television equipment (see col. 4, line 40 – col. 5, line 62).

Regarding claim 26, Seidman discloses the advertisements are transmitted to the user television equipment from the head end; and means for monitoring when advertisements that are transmitted from the head end are received at the user television equipment (see col. 6, lines 9-25).

Regarding claim 29, Seidman discloses the collecting information on the user activity is transmitted from the user television equipment to a data processing facility (head end), and the head end generates “summary”-type historical reports (see figure 6)

Art Unit: 2611

and "detailed" type reports (see figure 7) according to the collected information (see col. 7, lines 39-43). Obviously, the system comprising means for filtering out less important information from the collected information at the head end in order to provide a high quality report.

Regarding claim 30, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 29. Official Notice is taken that filtering based on specific advertisements is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein and Seidman with a well-known technique of filtering based on specific advertisements in order to provide a quality collected information.

Regarding claim 31, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on advertisements usage comprises means for collecting information for multiple user profiles (see figures 5-7).

Regarding claim 33, Seidman discloses means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements in the interactive television program guide by substantially all users of the system (see figures 4-6).

Regarding claim 34, Seidman discloses when Viewer Response Monitoring System is installed on the user's premises equipment (and optionally when other viewers wish to use the system), a viewer profile 12 is created for the user and stored in the STB RAM (see col. 6, lines 26-37). Inherently, the means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements comprises means for collecting information on the usage of the advertisements in the interactive television program guide by a subset of users of the system.

Regarding claims 35-52, 54-60, 63-65, 67-68, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 1-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-34 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 1-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-34.

6. Claims 19, 27-28, 53, 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (US 6,412,110) in view of Seidman et al. (US 6,298,482), and further in view of Aras et al. (5,872,588).

Regarding claim 19, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. However, neither Schein nor Seidman explicitly discloses means for collecting information on whether the user television equipment is muted during the display of the given program on the user television equipment.



Aras discloses separate AVI information for audio and video portions of AVMs may be utilized. Thus, objectionable language may be silenced while the video portion is presented (see col. 10, lines 17-20), and the user behaviors such are channel change, swap, pause, rewind, off, mute, record, etc. These responses may be to change a state variable, or to record information in the behavior collection table (see col. 14, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein in view of Welsh to incorporate a means as taught by Aras in order to allow advertiser to avoid using audio advertisements in the program.

Regarding claim 27, Aras discloses the advertisements are transmitted to the video distribution node from broadcast server and ITV server (see figure 1A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein and Seidman to incorporate server as taught by Aras in order to reduce capacity of advertisements stored at the head end. In addition, it would have been obvious that the server comprising means for monitoring when advertisements are transmitted from the server to the video distribution node in order to control the transmission.

Regarding claim 28, Aras discloses behavior of subscriber is transmitted from the user television equipment to a behavior collection center (see figure 4A). Aras further

Art Unit: 2611

discloses collected information in the behavior collection table can be deleted, updated (see col. 14, lines 8-12). Inherently, the system comprising means for filtering out less important information from the collected information prior to transmission of the collected information from the user television equipment.

Regarding claims 53, 61-62, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 19, 27-28 respectively and are analyzed with respect to the rejection of claims 19, 27-28.

7. Claims 32 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (US 6,412,110), and in view of Seidman et al. (US 6,298,482), and further in view of Furuya et al. (US 5,886,691).

Regarding claim 32, Schein in view of Seidman discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Seidman further disclosed messaged pertaining to the embedded data may or may not be filtered out by the microcontroller, depending on the viewer's history and interests (see col. 8, lines 21-50). However, neither Schein nor Seidman explicitly discloses displaying the real time ratings information on the user television equipment.

Furuya discloses displaying the real time ratings information on the user television equipment (see 18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schein and Seidman to incorporate means for displaying the real-time rating information as taught by Furuya in order to provide user ratings information.

Regarding claim 66, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 32 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claim 32.

8. Claims 71-76, 84-85, 94-99, 107-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335).

Regarding claims 71-75, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 70. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate means for providing an opportunity for defining a time frame of a particular hour, evening, day, week, instant for the real time ratings in order to provide rating of programs in a particular period of time, which would be the most interest to the consumers.

Regarding claim 76, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for providing an opportunity for selecting a geographic area for the real time ratings in order to provide user a rating of a particular

geographic area, which would be the most relevant to the consumers in a particular area.

Regarding claims 84-85, the elements correspond to the elements of claim 72 and 75 respectively and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejections of claims 72 and 75.

Regarding claims 94-99, 107-108, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the system being claimed in claims 71-76 and 84-85 and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claim 71-76 and 84-85.

9. Claims 87-88, 110-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335), and in view of Aras et al. (5,872,588).

Regarding claim 87, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. However, Hendricks does not explicitly disclose means for collecting information on whether a muting function is used when certain programs are watched.

Aras discloses separate AVI information for audio and video portions of AVMs may be utilized. Thus, objectionable language may be silenced while the video portion is presented (see col. 10, lines 17-20), and the user behaviors such are channel

change, swap, pause, rewind, off, mute, record, etc. These responses may be to change a state variable, or to record information in the behavior collection table (see col. 14, lines 8-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hendricks to incorporate a means as taught by Aras in order to allowed provider to avoid using audio in the program.

Regarding claim 88, Aras discloses each subscriber activity such as channel change or AVM stream change, pause, stop, picture in picture swap etc. or a filtered subset will be recorded (see col. 7, lines 18-20). It would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate means for collecting information on whether any portion of the video of a program is blocked as that program is watched in order to allow provider avoid transferring the blocked program in the future.

Regarding claims 110-111, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claims 87-88 respective and are analyzed as discussed with respect to the rejection of claims 87-88.

10. Claims 91 and 114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks et al. (US 6,181,335), and in view of Herz et al. (US 5,351,075).

Regarding claim 91, Hendricks discloses a system as discussed in the rejection of claim 69. Hendricks further discloses the real time ratings information comprises a list

of program, the system further comprising means for selecting one of the programs to watch (see figures 14-19). However, Hendricks does not explicitly disclose means for selecting one of the programs to record.

Herz discloses means for selecting one of the programs to record (see col. 5, lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hendricks to incorporate means for selecting one of the programs to record as taught by Herz in order to allow view to watch the program later.

Regarding claim 114, the elements of the method being claimed correspond to the elements of the system being claimed in claim 91 and are analyzed as discussed in the rejection of claim 91.

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Herz et al. (US 5,351,075) discloses home video club television broadcasting system.

Barrett et al. (US 6,005,597) discloses method and apparatus for program selection.

Miller et al. (US 5,842,199) discloses system, method and article of manufacture for using receiver operating curves to evaluate predictive utility.

Welsh (US 5,374,951) discloses method and system for monitoring television viewing.

Hendricks et al. (US 6,408,437) discloses reprogrammable terminal for suggesting programs offered on a television program delivery system.

Tsukidate et al. (US 6,262,721) discloses service supply apparatus for supplying a service of a broadcasting program with attribute information of the program.

Herz et al. (US 5,758,257) discloses system and method for scheduling broadcast of and access to video programs and other data using customer profiles.

Takasu (US 6,279,157) discloses program data transmission checking method and apparatus.


Art Unit: 2611

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son P Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-1889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Son P. Huynh  
September 27, 2002

  
ANDREW FAILE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600